## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN GREEN BAY DIVISION

GREEN BAY DIVISION	
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	)
Plainti	) Case No. 19-CR-67
v .	) ) Green Bay, WI
XENGXAI YANG,	) ) February 4, 2021
Defenda	) 1:30 p.m.
	OF SENTENCING HEARING
	RABLE WILLIAM C. GRIESBACH S SENIOR DISTRICT JUDGE
APPEARANCES:	
For the Plaintiff	
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:	United States Dept. of Justice (ED-WI)
	By: MR. ANDREW J. MAIER Office of the US Attorney
	205 Doty Street, Ste. 301 Green Bay, WI 54301
	Ph: 920-884-1066
	andrew.maier@usdoj.gov
For the Defendant XENGXAI YANG:	Federal Defender Services of
	Wisconsin By: MR. THOMAS E. PHILLIP
	801 E. Walnut Street, 2nd Fl. 54301
	Ph: 920-430-9900 Tom Phillip@fd.org
	Tom_Imilipola.org
U.S. Official Transcriber:	, ,
proceedings recorded by ele produced by computer-aided	ectronic recording, transcript transcription.

## TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

(Transcribed from audio recording.)

THE CLERK: Court is again in session. The Court calls Case No. 19-CR-67, United States of America versus Xengxai Yang, for sentencing. May I have the appearances, please.

MR. MAIER: Andrew Maier for the United States. Good afternoon, your Honor.

THE COURT: Good afternoon.

MR. PHILLIP: Good afternoon, your Honor. Tom Phillip appears. Mr. Yang appears by video from the Brown County Jail. Before we go any further, I will inform the Court that both Mr. Yang and I agree that this hearing can be held by video means. I believe that the Court has authority to hold the hearing by video under three different ways, first under the CARES Act, second under Judge Pepper's general orders making findings under the CARES Act.

Mr. Yang, if you could briefly mute your microphone.

THE DEFENDANT: Sure.

MR. PHILLIP: Thank you.

And then the Court can make specific findings for this case, I believe, under several reasons. First, Mr. Yang affirmatively wants to proceed today by video. He does not wish to delay the case any further. He's been in the Brown County Jail for about 22 months. And so there's no programming

really at the Brown County Jail, so he's anxious to move along to the next step in the prison system. I believe that waiting for an unknown date when in-person hearings could again be held would not be in his interest.

Also, based on both the number of victims and, also, the number of family members that would want to attend an in-person hearing, I think that with those numbers an in-person hearing would likely present a danger to public health. So rather, this type format allows, I would say, more people to participate. And indeed there's many people who have either dialed in or have video connections to attend today's hearing virtually.

So I think all of those reasons would give the Court enough to make specific findings and general findings allowing today's sentencing be held by video.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Phillip.

MR. KOEHLER: Good afternoon, your Honor. Brian Koehler on behalf of the US Probation Office.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, first off, I will make the findings required under the CARES Act to allow us to proceed by videoconferencing. I am satisfied from the statements made by Mr. Phillip that there -- that I can reasonably find and I do find that the interests of justice would be seriously impaired by further delay in these proceedings.

Certainly, the fact that Mr. Yang has been in custody for

22 months, almost two years, without programming is an important consideration. I think also the fact that the case is that old, that it has been -- that it has, as a result of change of counsel and then the withdrawal of the plea or the addition of the not guilty plea and the need for examinations, have delayed the case. And delay of this nature serious impacts not only the defendant, but certainly the victims, who I can tell from the victim impact statements have found it difficult to move on as this case continues to be pending.

So those reasons, as well as all of those given by Mr. Phillip, certainly support my finding that the interests of justice would be seriously impaired by further and indefinite delay. And I -- the chief judge's findings are of record, so I don't need to address that. And I accept Mr. Phillip's statement that he has consulted with his client and his client then consents to proceed in this fashion. So those are the required findings, so we can proceed.

So this is a sentencing hearing. Mr. Yang has been found guilty of armed bank robbery in violation of 18 USC Section 2113. That carries up to 25 years imprisonment and a \$250,000 fine. Count 2 brandishing a firearm during a crime of violence carries a mandatory minimum 10 years, a maximum of life imprisonment, and again a \$250,000 fine. That's a violation of 18 USC Section 924(c). And then Count 3 is unlawful possession of a firearm. This is a violation of 26 USC Section 5841, and

that carries a maximum term of 10 years in prison and a \$10,000 1 2 So those are the charges before us that require a determination on sentencing. 3 Mr. Maier, have you reviewed the presentence report? 4 MR. MAIER: I have, your Honor. 5 THE COURT: Are there any objections to the factual 6 7 statements in the presentence report? 8 MR. MAIER: No, your Honor. 9 THE COURT: And are you in agreement with the 10 recommended guideline calculation? 11 MR. MAIER: I am. 12 And, Mr. Phillip, I take it you've gone THE COURT: 13 over the presentence report with your client; is that correct? 14 MR. PHILLIP: Yes, your Honor. 15 THE COURT: Are there any objections to the factual 16 statements in the presentence report? 17 MR. PHILLIP: No, there are not. And we also agree 18 that the guidelines are correctly calculated in the reports, 19 and we accept those as well. We made some informal corrections 20 to the presentence report that are addressed in the final 21version, and so we'd agree that the Court can accept the 22 report. 23 So I will adopt, then, the factual THE COURT: Okav.

The

I'll also adopt the recommended guideline calculation.

statements in the presentence report as my findings of fact.

24

25

offense level is 24, the criminal history category is I. So the guideline range on Count 1 is 51 to 63 months. Count 2 carries a 10-year mandatory minimum, so that would be a 120 month guideline. And then Count 3 is -- I don't know, do we have a guideline range on Count 3? Or I guess the -- it's contained in the initial guideline I mentioned. It's a grouping of the offenses.

MR. PHILLIP: Yes.

THE COURT: Just one moment. I need to address something. Just one moment.

Okay. Very well. So that's the starting point in the sentencing determination. I've certainly read the presentence. I've read the defense memorandum -- sentencing memorandum and the letters, and the victim impact statements, letters from family and friends of Mr. Yang, and then the victim impact statements that have been submitted by the credit union personnel.

Is there any evidence or other statements or supplementation of those being offered today, Mr. Maier?

MR. MAIER: Your Honor, I do know that Kathy Cruz, who is -- she did submit a victim impact statement, but she is -- was the assistant branch manager. I think she may still be. She wanted to address the Court as well. And I know that the three victims are at the credit union and on video today.

THE COURT: Okay. And, Ms. Cruz, if you wish to make

a statement, this would be a good time to do so. Just state your full name, and then you can -- you can make your statement.

MS. CRUZ: Thank you. My name is Katherine Cruz. I am the branch manager at the location that was robbed.

Okay. I absolutely love what I do for a living. I love helping our members. I love assisting them in anything financial that they need help with. In a financial cooperative built on the principles of people helping people, I and my team are focused on servicing members, being part of solutions, and making a difference. At 5:51 p.m. on March 15th, 2019, my world changed when the robber came into my -- came into our office screaming and pointing a sawed off loaded rifle at my team and I.

My first thought was, "How do I protect them?" That is all I could think of. "How do I protect my team?" The thought of losing any one of them was unbearable, yet that was the situation I suddenly found myself in, the possibility of life or death. I'm their manager, and all I could do was watch this nightmare unfold right in front of us. I was terrified. I didn't know what to do. I didn't know what he was going to do. Was he going to rob us? Was he going to shoot us? I could hear the ammunition rolling around in his pockets every time he moved. I can still hear it to this day. It magnified the unknown, and the unknown was horrible.

I did as I was trained, burning images into my mind with the hope of being able to recount them with the police. At first, looking at his shoes was the first thing that came to mind. For the first few moments, I focused on his boots. Then I started looking at other things, like hair color, color of skin, searching for possible tattoos, rings, or piercings that would help identify him. I believe that he noticed me doing that. He told me to turn around, then zip tied my hands behind my back and did the same to Courtney.

I had a moment of relief when I noticed a police officer drive around the building. But in the meantime, terror and uncertainty ruled. He seemed so unhinged. What was he going to do to us? Finally, after restraining Courtney, he left. And we knew that we were physically all right. We were quickly surrounded by support from our credit union team, law enforcement, and trauma counselors. But I was changed. And I realized that I don't think I will ever be again who I was before the robbery.

So many things have changed. At first, I would try and put on a brave face and help Courtney and Alice cope with the aftermath of our experience. I tried to be the one that they knew that they could come to. I thought I was doing all right. It wasn't until my husband and I were driving home one afternoon, and I saw an individual with a black hoodie, black cargo pants on, and black boots. I started panicking in the

car as the memory of the robbery came rushing back. I have never seen the look on my husband's face when I started panicking. He got us out of there real quick. But what the robber took from me was my sense of security.

I look over my shoulder all the time. We've put a video doorbell and motion lights on the house. I carry protection with me wherever I'm legally allowed. And even before the pandemic hit, I would rarely go out anymore. Going to public places is a struggle for me, never knowing who could emerge from the crowd. Who knew that going to buy a gallon of milk would be such an issue.

I used to do a lot of volunteer work, and now I will only help if I can do it over the phone or by computer. There are extremely few people that I trust now. And even today, they help keep me grounded when I need it.

The robber was unfair. He had no right to do what he do to us. It wasn't just about the money. It wasn't just a victimless crime. He stole my security. In a matter of minutes, he instilled fear and anxiety in me that impacts me every day. Because of him, last month one of our neighbors was trying to play a joke on me and ducked down beside my car then jumped up on the driver's side screaming and pounding on the window. Before the robbery, I would have found that funny. Now I was hysterically sobbing in seconds. Even though I thought I was making progress and things were getting better,

it all came rushing back. When my friend was screaming, all I saw was the robber's face.

I'm back in counseling again. I've talked to my manager about possibly finding me another position within the credit union, which hopefully I won't have to do. But I can't let the robber control me, but it's difficult. Some days I have to take things one step at a time, especially with our members coming in with masks on. I am an extremely determined individual, and I can't let what he did to us derail my career that I have worked so hard for because of his selfishness and thoughtlessness in bringing violence and fear into our lives.

I am respectfully asking the Court to reprimand him to a federal facility for 20 years for the following reasons: It will give each of us, Courtney, Alice and I, time to heal and time to move on with our lives. In 20 years, Alice and I will both be retired. And my husband and I have plans to move out of the area afterwards. I'm hopeful that Courtney will have graduated in her field of study and moved on to the next chapter of her life.

The robber not only took my security away, but he has made me second-guess most of my decisions. Everything is now based on whether or not I'll be safe. Knowing he is incarcerated for 20 years can help give me that security and peace of mind. When the robber is released and if his mom is still living in the same location that she is right now, he will only be living

blocks from the branch. 20 years can make that less of a possibility and less of an opportunity to once again "try something new" that will hurt others in trying to get even.

The robber has made a mockery out of the court system with inconsistent claims of incompetency, changing stories, and attempts to save himself without any consideration for the victims of his crime. He has not shown any remorse or extended an apology. A sentence of 20 years will provide plenty of time for reflection.

Before all this happened, Courtney and Alice were my team members. Now they are my family. I know that all three of us will support each other, but I also know all too well the struggles that each of us are facing in the aftermath of this trauma. To this day, I'm still wondering what I could have done to make this less traumatic for them. Requesting a sentence of 20 years is one thing I can do. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Ms. Cruz. Mr. Maier then.

MR. MAIER: Thank you, your Honor. I want to reference briefly the other two victim impact statements. We had the other two victims each recommending 15 years in prison. They all -- they all really described a similar experience to what Ms. Cruz just did in relaying her victim impact statement to the Court. This is not something that happens in a vacuum, this crime. And, you know, she's right, they didn't deserve to

have this happen to them.

This isn't something -- nobody's saying this, of course, but sometimes you hear things callously in the community like, "People that work at a bank or gas station should be prepared to be robbed," you know, "They receive training," and that sort of thing. But they don't deserve to have a gun pointed at them and be zip tied and treated -- treated this way by someone who was member in the credit union.

They certainly indicate in the victim impact statements the trauma that this caused which will be long-lasting. The Government's view is that that's relevant to the seriousness of the offense. It's relevant to the need for public protection in this case as well. What I'm asking you to do is impose a sentence at the top end of the guideline, so 183 months. The -- the reason for this is there -- there's a few reasons. And the first is that we have enhancements within the guidelines calculation for things like taking -- actually taking money during a bank robbery and for restraining employees in order to conceal the crime.

One of things that we don't have, which I think is a factor here, is the disguising of the appearance. It's not a guidelines enhancement. It certainly fits into the seriousness of the offense. But I think you can see from -- I can't recall which victim impact statement talked about it, but going to a concert. And it's probably not a kind of music the Court would

listen to, but to see performers come out wearing masks similar to that worn during the robbery ruined that experience for her.

You know, there's things that will trigger them even with therapy, even with counseling, even with some time, that will make them think about this robbery. Seeing someone walk down the street in a not uncommon outfit, dark pants, dark hoodie or jacket. That's a lot of Wisconsinites a lot of the year. You can hear the -- so that it's -- you can hear that this crime had a tremendous negative impact on the victims.

We also I think in looking at the need to balance that punishment and deterrent purpose of the sentencing, we don't necessarily have a situation in the Government's view where we can assume that rehabilitation is possible or even really desirable. This is a defendant who has never explained why he did this, except to say he wanted to try something new. He has never openly expressed any remorse. I supposed today is his day. He's never said anything about the impact of the offense on the victims.

When he was interviewed right after -- I know the Court watched the interview; it was part of the bench trial in this case -- he more or less didn't have any feelings at all for the people that he had done this to and really didn't have any feelings at all about any of it.

As it relates to the treatment needs or the rehabilitative needs, we have -- we had two experts provide reports to the

Court on the issue of insanity who had concerns about him malingering as to lack of memory. He claimed an inability to recall anything when the PSR writer first interviewed him about a year ago. This contrasts pretty sharply with the law enforcement interview where he provided information about what he had done.

He's claimed influence of auditory hallucinations, but didn't demonstrate any of the typical signs of experiencing that when Dr. Johnson interviewed him. So I think we have someone who's really a risk and needs to be incarcerated for the longest reasonable amount of time possible. I think in this case that -- that number is at the top end of the guidelines. It's 15 years and three months.

And I think you can -- you can give a lot of -- a lot of comfort to these three women. And I know that that's not the purpose of sentencing, your Honor. But the -- the victim impact statement written I believe it was by Courtney talked at the very last page of the PSR as filed electronically, she would have graduated college, she can have a bachelor's degree and a master's degree, be working in her dream career, be a lifetime away from this. And Kathy can be with her husband somewhere else retired and, you know, experiencing the happiness of the end of a career and a relaxed life knowing that until then Mr. Yang is locked up and won't do this to them or anyone else.

So I think the appropriate sentence is 183 months, and that's what I'm asking on behalf of the Government for you to impose today. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Mr. Maier.
Mr. Phillip?

MR. PHILLIP: Thank you. The Court here has a great deal of information based on the presentence report, the psychological examinations, and then, of course, presiding over the trial at which the experts testified. And with all of that, the Court certainly has enough information about the nature and circumstances of the offense and the history and characteristics of the defendant.

I want to go backwards a moment, and I've already said it

-- the Court has, too -- I want to talk briefly about the fact
that this case took a long time. The events were from March
15th of 2019, so that's about 22 months ago, give or take. And
the case was delayed at first so Mr. Yang could be examined by
Dr. Berney. There was a change of counsel in there. There was
a second exam by Dr. Johnson.

And during that time when I came onto the case and retained Dr. Johnson, we had a great difficulty caused by the pandemic, and that caused longer delay. And then finally, I won't characterize this as delay, but the case was litigated quite a bit back and forth, and that took time as well.

Now, none of that, in my opinion, was any delay for delay's

sake or from inattention. This case was complicated, not so much factually. The case, as the Court was aware from the materials submitted at trial, was -- took place all in really a very short time back on March 15th, 2019. Mr. Yang was arrested moments after leaving the credit union, right -- maybe a block or so away. So the facts aren't so complicated, but the issues presented in the case are. And none of those issues have been frivolous.

The not guilty by reason of mental disease or defect plea, for example, is not something that's frivolous. It's something really that seldom happens. For me in my career in this Court, in federal court, I may have brought that up maybe three times in 18 years. In my entire career, maybe five times in 25 years. So that's not something that comes up without a basis. I treat my work for my clients very, very seriously. I have a duty to the Court, and I have a duty to myself to only bring issues that I believe have a basis.

So Mr. Yang was examined by two separate psychologists. Really between the two them combined, they had over 70 years of experience in their fields. And though they differed in their final conclusion, both found Mr. Yang to have similar diagnoses going back to age nine. And with those reports, we have an adversary system of justice, so Mr. Maier and I have different functions. And we both worked, as we should, as professionally and capably as we could to fulfill our functions. And then the

Court made rulings throughout the case on issues as they were presented. So this took a long time to do. Some of it was through litigation. Some of it was delay caused by the pandemic that no one could have predicted.

But none of the delay or none of the issues brought up in this case were any attempt to manipulate the process. Certainly the Court wouldn't have allowed any attempt to manipulate the process. The criminal justice system that we have isn't designed to achieve speed. It isn't just designed to achieve punishment. The goal is to achieve a just result, and sometimes that result takes a lot of effort and a lot of time.

So now having gone through that, now we're at the point where the Court does impose the sentence. And so as the parties are obviously familiar, the Court looks at the nature and circumstances of the offense, the history and characteristics of the defendant, and the Court tries to accomplish the policy goals from the statute of respect for the law, deterrence, protection of the public, provision of treatment, and just punishment. So the goal is to come to a sentence that is sufficient but not greater than necessary to encompass those goals.

So the guidelines and the statute together suggest a sentence of approximately 14 to 15 years. Ten years of that comes from the brandishing charge, Count 2. And I have no

argument against that. Using a firearm during a crime of violence, as this is, significantly increases the danger of the facts of the case, significantly increases the seriousness of the facts of the case. So obviously the imposition of that 10-year mandatory minimum portion of the sentence provides respect for the law, because that comes directly from a mandate of Congress that must be followed. And the term realistically is likely to be longer than that 10 years. Again, the guidelines suggest four to five years. And adding 10 years, that's where we get to the 14 to 15 years. And as I wrote in my memorandum, that is the correct guideline and analysis.

But the practical, factual real world part of the case is that this isn't separate events. It's all one event. The 10-year part is legally distinct, but it leads to one total sentence for one event. So I would argue that the Court can still encompass all of the statutory policies with a slightly lower sentence, perhaps 12 or 13 years, rather than the 14 or 15 suggested by the guidelines.

Obviously, any sentence that the Court is going to impose, whatever it is, is going to punish Mr. Yang. That punishment has already started. He's been in custody for just under two years already. And it's not likely that he would be released under any realistic sentence until after the turn of the next decade. So any term longer than 10 years is significant punishment. That punishment, that term behind bars, of course,

protects the public because Mr. Yang is incapacitated. He's behind bars.

This case, because of the charges at issue, has five years of supervised release available. That's more than the three years that come with most federal statutes. And federal supervision, as the Court and parties already know, is thorough. And it really provides meaningful support for the defendant. It also provides very meaningful protection of the public. There is always a possibility that if Mr. Yang engages in any other kind of criminal activity in the future, not just this kind of criminal activity, that he can go back into custody. That's a practical deterrent for the future.

Overall, the total sentence both prison and supervised release is going to provide adequate deterrence that the statute requires. General deterrence is always, in my opinion, somewhat unknown, but it is still likely to occur in this case based on the sheer number that the Court is going to impose, the sheer number of years the Court's going to impose.

Specific deterrence, as I frequently argue, is much more concrete. And so obviously Mr. Yang is going to be deterred. The initial deterrence comes from the sentence itself, prison sentence itself. And then as I already said, the practical deterrent later of supervised release. So deterrence lasts beyond the actual number of years into the community when he's eventually released.

I want to end by just briefly talking about Mr. Yang's history and the future. I almost never end a sentencing argument with the defendant's history. That's usually a place where I begin. But here, as I'm -- as I was preparing for today's sentencing, I continually reminded myself that Mr. Yang just turned 21 and that he really doesn't have that much history. His history is really going to be made in the future.

I'll refer to one of the victim's statements that suggested a 15-year term would be -- would be what she requested. And I was taken by a phrase that the victim used there. She graciously said that Mr. Yang would still be young when he was released, that he could still have a life. And that's true. I think that's correct. I think that's perceptive.

Mr. Yang can get treatment while he's in custody. I would gently disagree with the Government where Mr. Maier -- I want to get the words right -- that he couldn't assume that rehabilitation is desirable for Mr. Yang. I'd gently disagree with that, because I always think rehabilitation is desirable. Prison system is not designed for rehabilitation. It's a probably secondary or tertiary concern in the prison system. Their main concern is punishment and security. I don't disagree with that.

Rehabilitation is hard to mandate upon someone.

Rehabilitation comes when someone wants to change their life on their own and takes advantage then of opportunities that are

offered. While there will be treatment and there will be some rehabilitation in custody during the sentence, during that sentence, the community will be protected. The victims will have peace of mind. I think they should also have peace of mind by the term of supervision.

But again, eventually Mr. Yang will be released. And another thing I was struck by in preparing for today, was by Mr. Yang's family support. All of the letters that I filed said the same thing, that the family members, whether they are brothers and sisters or cousins or other extended family, they all said that they would be there for him when he got out. And so that's my nod to the future, that after he is imprisoned, Mr. Yang will get support from his family and from the probation office to give him that opportunity to never come back, because that's what we all want.

None of us want Mr. Yang to come back for any reason whatsoever. I certainly don't. The Court certainly doesn't. Mr. Maier certainly doesn't. The victims certainly don't. And so I think that a sentence slightly less than the guideline range still accomplishes all of the goals of sentencing. It punishes, it protects, it deters. And during the term of supervision, it gives Mr. Yang some opportunity to make something of himself that he hasn't yet.

So to summarize, I'd ask that the Court impose a sentence below the guideline range. I'd ask that the Court impose the five years of supervision. Mr. Yang has no ability to pay a fine, so I'd ask the Court to decline imposing one. No restitution has been requested. I'd ask that the judgment reflect two recommendations, one for mental health treatment, and two for placement as close to home as possible.

I'd ask that the Court -- after imposing sentence that the Court read the conditions of supervision out loud. I've gone through them with Mr. Yang, and they're also in the presentence report. But I'd ask that the Court read them today. Finally then, your Honor, Mr. Yang has prepared a short statement that he would read to the Court at this point.

Mr. --

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Phillips.

MR. PHILLIP: Mr. Yang --

THE COURT: Mr. Yang --

MR. PHILLIP: Sorry, your Honor.

If you can unmute your microphone, you can address the Court.

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Yang, if you have anything to say, now is your opportunity.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. I want to say how sorry I am for what I've done to the hard-working employees of the bank. I truly apologize for my wrongful acts, and I understand there will be anger and shame towards me. I have affected countless lives and families, including my own. And I

know there is nothing I can say or do to change that.

Since my incarceration, I have gone through the saddest moments in my life. I lost my fiancée, including my son. And I'm about to lose so much time that I can never get back. But the saddest one of them all was may father passing away. It hurt so much because I was not able to see him one last time in person. I cannot risk going through that again.

During my incarceration, I plan on furthering my education.

I will also be participating in treatment programs that will help me rehabilitate and prepare me to become a positive functioning member in society upon my release.

I am now a father, and there are duties and responsibilities waiting for me when I get out. So I will use this time wisely to better my life for myself and my family. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Mr. Yang. We're getting a lot of feedback -- yeah, that would help. Thank you.

Well, in fashioning a sentence, I'm required to begin with the guideline range. And here the guideline total is in the neighborhood of 14 and a half to over 15 years, in that neighborhood. That's a starting point, but it's not a presumptive sentence. The Court is required to consider the nature and circumstances of the offense and the history and character of the defendant and then fashion a sentence which meets certain goals, the first of which is to impose just punishment for the offense. And just punishment, of course, is

punishment that reflects the seriousness of the offense and promotes respect for the law.

But other purposes of sentencing is deterrence.

Deterrence, of course, is the message-sending function of the sentence. It tells both the defendant and others who might be tempted to engage in such conduct that this crime does not pay. The costs of committing it are so steep that you will not want to do this. And, of course, the more serious the offense, the more strong that message needs to be sent strongly. Another purpose of sentence is to protect the public from further crimes of the defendant and then lastly and but also important is, of course, rehabilitation of the defendant.

So turning first to the nature and circumstances of the offense, you know, there's no dispute, a robbery, the taking of property by use of force, is a serious offense. To arm oneself with firearms, to restrain using these ties, plastic ties, the innocent, you know, tellers at the bank and the manager, this is a -- this is a very serious offense. No civilized society can tolerate a masked person going into a credit union or a financial institution armed with a loaded gun and then pointing it at people and then demanding money and walking out. So we're obviously talking about a -- an extremely serious offense.

And I -- Mr. Maier is correct that the impact upon the victims is certainly one of the factors I take into

consideration in assessing the seriousness of the offense. As I said before, in many types of cases if there was a sentence I could impose that would undo that trauma, that would take away that loss, that feeling of insecurity, I certainly would do it. But that's not something within this Court's ability. I can impose a just sentence, and that requires that I certainly consider the impact on the victims and the seriousness of the offense. But I'm also required to consider those other factors relating to the defendant, namely his history and character and then that need for the sentence ultimately to meet all those other goals.

In turning to another factor, it's worth mentioning because I think Mr. Phillip spent a good deal of time talking about the history of the case, and there is a concern that the -- this idea that the Court has been manipulated or there's been an effort to play games here. And I made specific findings at the conclusion of the trial on the issue of mental disease or defect where I think I unequivocally rejected the argument or the defense that the defendant was mentally ill.

But I didn't find it frivolous, and I think it's important to note how bizarre this crime was and is. This is a person without any prior record, who walked into a credit union masked and commits this crime and then walks out in broad daylight still donning his mask, is immediately apprehended as he's on the sidewalk, and essentially caught red-handed. And we have a

lengthy interview with the detective trying to figure out why he did these things.

It was -- because it was so out of character and because it didn't -- the manner in which it was committed was so bizarre, and by that I mean there wasn't a getaway car, it was his own credit union, he asked for a withdrawal -- I mean, there was lot of strange things about this that raised questions as to what kind of state of mind, what -- what was going on in this defendant.

And I'll -- I think I should emphasize that a basic principle of our legal system is that we do not punish people for conduct that's the result of severe mental illness or illness that robs them of their freedom and is the cause of that type of crime. Now, rarely would a robbery be seen in that type of situation. But nevertheless, that issue arose.

We did have the defendant examined, and the original psychiatrist -- psychologist issued a report that was -- it was not a clear rejection of the defense. It was essentially it wasn't strong enough or the evidence wasn't strong enough. And so Mr. Phillip, when he took over this case, naturally looked at that and concluded that a follow-up evaluation might give him a better idea. And I think Mr. Phillip's point about he does not take these things -- or he takes these things seriously and does not lightly interpose such a defense, that's my -- he's been practicing in front of me for a long time. I

certainly did not think it was frivolous to raise the defense given the original psychological evaluation, the one he received from Dr. Johnson, and of course the bizarre nature of the offense itself, and the seemingly-out-of-character behavior.

So I say that not as a defense of the conduct of the defendant, but to try to help people understand how our system works and why it may seem that it was manipulated or that there were things being done that didn't make sense. And yet it was an appropriate response to the evidence that was apparent in this case.

Now, having listened to the psychologist, having reviewed the initial interview, I of course rejected. And frankly there was evidence of -- that the defendant was manipulating, that he -- and I -- my sense is that there was this loss of recollection of the things and the -- absent of a history of a severe mental illness led me to conclude that that defense wasn't viable.

On the other hand, I'm still left with a very bizarre crime. And as I explained at the time, the explanation given is not -- it's not a very reasonable one. It's a bizarre one. It's the one one would maybe expect out of a very immature person who doesn't really appreciate the magnitude of what he was doing, not because of a mental illness, but because of perhaps a lack of maturity or a blindness to the impact upon

other people.

Again, I -- I look at these -- the family support. And I'm looking at the letter of Jensen Yang, one of the defendant's brothers. He describes him, he says, "Xengxai has grown into other people's lives where his kindness and joy resonates indefinitely. We remember XengXai as the funny little brother who always puts a smile on our faces and reminds us that even the smallest things can make our worst days a little better. I admired XengXai's motivation for always striving for greatness.

"He's always so eager to learn, and I've seen firsthand from how far he has come. From learning to fix cars on his own, doing projects around the house, or even learning how to engineer his own mini-projects. I'm amazed on how determined he was, and I believe he can become something great. I'm faithful that we'll be able to give XengXai an opportunity to let him find his true caring character or to leave behind those negative traits which don't belong him. Your Honor, thank you very much." Okay.

The point I'm trying to make is this reminds me of the defendant's description of himself to the detective who interviewed him. He said he was bored. He had learned everything. This is hardly the behavior or conduct or description of a person with a severe mental illness that drove him to commit a crime that he otherwise wouldn't have committed. And I'm struck by how, again, the -- the lack of

appreciation of the magnitude of the crime that he was committing, the impact upon the victims of the offense and the consequences.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

That doesn't reduce the magnitude of the crime, but it does tell me something about the defendant, as well as the fact he doesn't have a prior record. I mean, this is not a person who was in trouble all the time. There's no juvenile record. I've been doing this a long time, and typically dangerous people aren't suddenly dangerous and then not dangerous. There's a behavior we look at that we see coming along. And that's not to say you can have, you know, crazed things happen all the That's unfortunately one of the things that makes life itself a risk, you know, to -- placing this person in prison for 20 years, this is one person. There are a lot of people out there, and I'm not -- luckily the vast majority of people are decent or at least decent enough to commit such a horrible crime.

But I look at the defendant, and there -- this is in one sense a very bizarre period or event in his life. And yet it was done consciously. It was done for no real decent reason. It was done out of boredom, and the impact is huge. And he will suffer a significant penalty, and much of it is beyond my control.

But I -- those are the factors that I take into consideration, not only the magnitude of the offense itself,

but I look at the immaturity of the defendant, the youthfulness, the absence of a prior record. And I ask myself what sentence is necessary in order to, one, impose just punishment, two, to deter others, three, to protect the public, and, four, to provide opportunities for rehabilitation. And considering all of those factors, I'm satisfied that it's very close to the guideline.

I'm going to impose a sentence of 48 months on Counts 1 and 3. That's four years. That's consecutive to the 120 months, the 10 years, on Count 2. And I'm going a little bit under, not much, because of the factors that I've elicited or talked about concerning the immaturity and the bizarre nature of the crime, the -- my sense that the defendant had lack of appreciation.

I note -- I certainly agree rehabilitation is always something we look at and is certainly possible in every case. That's the wonderful thing about being a human being, you can change. In fact, we all change. We change year to year. Frankly, we change week to week. Fourteen years is a long time for Mr. Yang, and he will change. And I -- I think when I look at his background and I look at his family, I look at the -- the history in the case, it seems to me that this is sufficient but not greater than necessary to accomplish those important goals. Obviously, it's a tremendously lengthy period of time for someone who's never been in jail before, never been in

trouble before. Seldom does a person get a first sentence of this magnitude in the absence of actually, you know, physically injuring someone. That's not to minimize the damage and the injury and the effect on the victims in this case. But it's to recognize that this is not -- could have been something very different.

It also, I'm satisfied, is sufficient to deter whoever might be deterrable. And I'm also satisfied with the five years of supervision that I will add on top of that. That's five years on the -- on the count -- is it Count 2 that carries the five years and then the other three are counts concurrent with it for the total of five years of supervision.

I will impose the \$100 special assessment on each count. A fine is waived. He doesn't have the financial wherewithal, ability to pay a fine. The judgment will also include recommendations for mental health. I'm not denying there's a mental health component here. But as I read the family description and as I see he's now gotten his high school diploma out of the Brown County Jail, I am still convinced that this is not -- this was not caused by a mental illness of the kind of severity that would be needed to absolve him of criminal responsibility.

I will also include in the judgment a recommendation that the -- he be as close to his home as possible. The federal facility, the only one in Wisconsin is Oxford, but he may not qualify. And that's obviously up to the Bureau of Prisons.

The conditions of supervised release, then, will be as follows. And I take it from what you've said, Mr. Phillip, that there's no objection to the recommended conditions in the presentence report?

MR. PHILLIP: Correct, your Honor. We informally resolved one objection I did have. And so the conditions that are in the report we do not object to them. I believe that they're reasonably related to the offense and the defendant. But, again, I would ask that the Court read them out loud.

THE COURT: Okay. These are the mandatory conditions of supervision. The defendant shall not commit another federal, state, or local crime.

He shall not illegally possess or use any controlled substance. I find there's a low risk of future substance abuse by the defendant and, therefore, suspend the drug testing requirements. And it should be noted that there just isn't a history of drug abuse here or alcohol abuse.

Conditions of supervision, additional conditions: The defendant is to report to his probation office in the district to which he is released within 72 hours of his release from the custody of the Bureau of Prisons. And he's to report to the probation officer in a manner and frequency as reasonably directed by the Court or his probation officer.

Two, the defendant shall not leave the State of Wisconsin

without permission of the Court or his probation officer.

Three, he shall answer truthfully all inquiries put to him by his probation officer subject to his Fifth Amendment right against self-incrimination, and he's to follow the reasonable instructions of his probation officer.

Four, he's to use his best efforts to support his dependants.

Five, he's to use his bests efforts to find and hold lawful employment, unless he's excused by his probation officer for schooling, training, or other acceptable reasons such as child care, elder care, et cetera.

The defendant shall notify his probation officer, this is No. 6, at least 10 days prior to any change of his place of residence or his place of employment. If such prenotification is not possible, he's to notify his agent within 72 hours after the change.

Seven, the defendant shall not associate with any persons known by him to be engaged in or planning to be engaged in criminal activity. "Associate" as used here means reside with or regularly socialize with such person.

No. 8, the defendant shall permit a probation officer to visit him at reasonable times at home and shall permit confiscation of any contraband that's observed in plain view by his probation officer.

No. 9, the defendant shall notify the probation officer

within 72 hours of being arrested or questioned by a law enforcement officer.

No. 10, the defendant shall not enter into any agreement to act as an informant or a special agent of a law enforcement agency without the permission of the Court.

Eleven, the defendant shall have no contact with the victim bank or credit union or its employees, including letters, communication devices, audio or visual devices, visits, or any contact through a third person without the prior written consent of his probation officer and shall enter the premise -- not enter the premises or loiter within 1,000 feet of the victim bank.

And the only reason a probation officer would give written consent is for a letter of apology, and they would first contact the victims before that would be allowed. And that would go through the -- through the probation agent. Let me indicate that.

The defendant shall participate in a mental health program and shall take any and all prescribed medications as directed by the treatment provider and participate in any psychological or psychiatric evaluation and counseling as approved by his supervising probation officer. The defendant shall pay the cost of this treatment under the guidance and supervision of the probation officer.

I want to emphasize that this is a five-year term of

supervision that follows completion of the sentence. So he's going to be either in prison or under the supervision of the Court for a minimum of 19 years. If there's a violation while he's on probation, the Court can not only -- and the violation can be something like not reporting to his agent or using drugs and alcohol, things like that. The Court can then either revoke him and send him back to prison if the violation is serious enough, or impose further restrictions like electronic monitoring. The Court also has the ability to increase the term of supervision and lengthen it so that additional time might be on supervision.

I say that because to the extent that I've entered a sentence below the guideline, the supervision I've added on certainly will provide additional protection and safeguards. But the basic point and the overall view is when one looks at the entire life of this defendant, there just isn't this behavior. And, again, I think that more than anything else and the bizarre nature this crime led to the sense of the search for some sort of mental health component that ultimately I certainly rejected and note again.

And it reminds me of the employment history that he has.

None of that would be consistent, it seems to me, with this severe type of mental illness that would have been required to absolve the criminal responsibility. In any event, those are the conditions that I've imposed. As I said, if there are

violations or problems on release, they can be addressed.

Mr. Yang, you're a young person. You're going to spend a lot of time in prison, as you know. You've been there a while already. It already seems to have had some impact. I urge you to really consider carefully the impact upon your behavior, not just on your family. I can see from the letters, you've been a good son, a good brother, a good -- you know, in many respects. But your obligation as a human being doesn't just -- isn't limited to your family. It's to your fellow man, your fellow -- you know, our fellow citizens. We don't treat people, nobody -- no civilized society can withstand or allow someone to treat people like you treated these three women. And that's -- you can't undo that. It would be nice if we could. But you can certainly, you know, consider it and make sure you guide your future life by your desire to make amends.

And really you've noted you're -- the fact that you're a father to a son. The last thing would you ever want is your son to make these kinds of mistakes. You have lessons to teach, but only if you -- if you make sure you build your own life back and into the kind of life that your siblings suggest and that I have no doubt others can be proud of. But that is really in your hands. This sentence is not a death sentence. It doesn't condemn you. It condemns your behavior. But you're certainly capable of being far better than that day in October of 2019.

So that's the sentence of the Court. Other than appeal 1 2 rights, have I omitted anything? 3 MR. PHILLIP: No, your Honor. MR. MAIER: No, your Honor. 4 THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Yang, you do have the right to 5 6 appeal your conviction or your sentence. Your attorney will 7 talk to you about possible grounds to appeal. If you cannot afford the costs of an appeal, the clerk will assist you so you 8 9 can file in forma pauperis and not have to pay those costs.  $\mathbf{If}$ 10 you choose to appeal, you have to file a notice of appeal 11 within 14 days of the entry of the judgment. If you fail to 12 file a timely notice of appeal, you would lose your right --13 that right. Do you understand those things? 14 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 15 THE COURT: Okav. Then this matter is concluded. 16 Thank you all. 17 (At 2:32 p.m. the hearing ended.) 18 19 20 21 22 23

24

25

## $C\ E\ R\ T\ I\ F\ I\ C\ A\ T\ E$

Court Reporter for the United States District Court for the

foregoing is a true and correct transcription of the audio file

Jennifer L. Stake, RDR, CRR United States Official Court Reporter 517 East Wisconsin Avenue, Room 324

Jennifer Stake@wied.uscourts.gov

53202

Milwaukee, WI

provided in the aforementioned matter to the best of my skill

Eastern District of Wisconsin, do hereby certify that the

I, JENNIFER L. STAKE, RDR, CRR, an Official

0	
4	

1

3

4

5 6

7

8

and ability.

9

10

11

12 Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2425

ELECTRONICALLY SIGNED BY JENNIFER L. STAKE Official Court Reporter, RDR, CRR

Dated this 28th day of July, 2022.

Jiiicial Court Reporter, RDR, CRR